



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/523,903	08/19/2005	Danny Louis Cornelius Morlion	003D.0049.U1(US)	7558

29683 7590 07/26/2006

HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP
4 RESEARCH DRIVE
SHELTON, CT 06484-6212

EXAMINER

ABRAMS, NEIL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2839

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/523,903	Applicant(s) MORLION	
	Examiner Neil Abrams	Art Unit 2839	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Figure 1 must be labeled prior art.

Fig 3 device and related discussion is unclear. What is purpose of capacitor 17, none clearly stated in spec.

Claims 3, 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 3,7 are unclear. Just what limitations are covered by each claim is uncertain.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The disclosure does not provide details adequate for enablement with regard to "isolate" feature, . no numerals are used for this aspect.

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the claim 3 features must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure

number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claims 1,2,3,4,5,6,7, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art APA in view of Larabell, Bassler, Naito and Boutros

APA fig 1 includes a first part connector 2,4, a second part connector 3,15, both with ground and signal contacts, but no disclosure of power transmission or of a circuit in part 3,15 Naito figs 8,9 , Larabell and Bassler use connectors with power transmission along with signals .Obvious to provide such features in in APA to provide voltages to operate a device that would be at the end of cable 14, (see 90 of Larabell.)

This would be adequate for claims 1,2, since recitation of use of a "ground" as a power defines no structural difference over use of power contacts. Claim 2, part 2 is a device board. Claim 3, as best understood included at this time. For claims 4,5, obvious to provide a circuit in the second part in view of Boutros at 3,3', figs 1,16. and larabell fig 4. It is admittedly typical to use components in a plug -in connectors to

enable easy change of circuits. Power transmission from the host would typically be used to affect such components as in Larabell.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Larabell alone or Larabell taken in view of Naito, Bassler and Boutros.

Larabell figs 3,5 includes a first part host 70 with connector and with a power supply, a second part connector at 10,13 and also at 90 that in each case receives power from part 70 through cables 64,80. The connectors are seen to include power, signal and ground contacts, Reference to a ground used as a power contact defines no structure over a usual power contact. Should Larabell signal, ground, power, contact teachings be at issue, distinct power, ground and signal contact use also taught by Naito and Bassler. Obvious to use such types in Larabell for proper operation of item 90. For claims 2,7 part 70 is readable as a device board as broadly recited Further obvious to use a circuit board in view of Bassler fig 1B at 102. This is typical electronic device feature. Cable shown at 80 leads to third part 90. Claim 3 as best understood does not define over Larabell. In addition Bassler uses noise reduction (isolation). Obvious to use same in Larabell for lessened EMI effects Claim 4 circuit limitations do not define over Larabell repeater. Further obvious to use equalization circuitry in view of Butros for better signal transmission. Claims 6,7, covered by above discussion.

For claims 1,2,3,6,7 Larabell is also applied with first part (host) connector 10,13 (repeater) supply line fig 4, below 52. and second part 82 that receives power

Art Unit: 2839

from host 10,13. Power, ground contact use present in Larabell with Naito , bassler applied should issues arise.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Neil Abrams at telephone number 571-272-2089.


NEIL ABRAMS
PRIMARY EXAMINER